A A C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C C		
Minute ender	Form (06/27)	

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

()	0)
-	

1						
Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	James B. Moran	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge				
CASE NUMBER	01 C 9381	DATE	9/16/2003			
CASE TITLE	Jeff Con	ners vs. Ford Motor	r Company			

In the following box (a) indicate the party filing the motion, e.g., plaintiff, defendant, 3rd party plaintiff, and (b) state briefly the nature

				Memorandum Opinion and Oro	der	
DOC	CKET EN	TRY:				
(1)		Filed 1	notion of [use l	isting in "Motion" box above.]	101.	
(2)		Brief i	n support of mo	otion due		
(3)		Answe	r brief to motio	n due Reply to answer brief due_	,	
(4)		Ruling	/Hearing on	set for at		
(5)		Status	hearing[held/co	ontinued to] [set for/re-set for] ons	et for at	
(6)		Pretria	al conference[he	old/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on	set for at	'
(7)		Trial[s	set for/re-set for] on at		
(8)		[Bene	h/Jury trial] [He	aring] held/continued to at	.*	
(9)				[with/without] prejudice and without costs ocal Rule 41.1 □ FRCP41(a)(1) □ FR		
	judgi	ment is ;	granted.			
(11)				order attached to the original minute order	·.]	
	1		dvised in open com	't.		Document Number
	No notices required. Notices mailed by judge's staff.		gc's staff.		SEP 1 7 2003	<u> </u>
		ounsel by te	=		date docketed	
1	Docketing	to mail not	ices.		()	
1	Mail AO 4	150 form.		U.S. DISTRICT COURT	docketing deputy minds	_
	Copy to ju	idge/magisti	rate judge. I	07.0 11. 01. 225.54		
	WAH		countroom deputy's initials	Care Hailer 19200	date mailed notice	
				/ Date/time received in rentral Clerk's Office	nailing deputy initials	

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

-=,

JEFF CONNERS,)	
Plaintiff,)	DOGNETED
vs.) No. 01 C 9381	SEP 1 7 2003
FORD MOTOR COMPANY,)	
Defendant.	<i>)</i>	

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Plaintiff alleges that he was discriminated against because of his race, Caucasian, by defendant's failure to consider him for its DD Program. Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment on June 13, 2003. Plaintiff sought and obtained various extensions of time to respond, the last to September 3, 2003. No response has been filed. Pursuant to Local Rule 56.1(b)(3)(B), defendant's statement of material facts is deemed admitted.

A review of those material facts probably explains why no response was filed. Plaintiff never filed a DD Program application. Even if he had filed such an application, the likelihood of its acceptance was nil. His financial situation was not even remotely robust enough to qualify and his brief experience as a general manager had not been a success. The dealership sustained losses, the losses were increasing, and customer satisfaction evaluations were below average.

Plaintiff's only real evidence of any racial aspect to the case is his testimony that a Ford employee denigrated his likelihood of being accepted in the DD Program by saying plaintiff could not go through the program because he was not African-American (the employee denies

41

No. 01 C 9381 Page 2

making the remark). But the employee was a lower-level employee who did not have any decision-making responsibilities for the DD Program. Further, although the DD Program may very well be a means for encouraging minority participation by making funding available to persons with limited capital, it is not confined to minority applicants, and Caucasians who meet the requirements do participate.

Defendant's motion for summary judgment is granted.

JAMES B. MORAN

Senior Judge, U. S. District Court